[31st January 1931

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"If the hon. Member reads the judgment, he will get the information he wants."

Mr. D. THOMAS :—"Do not the Government feel the necessity of prosecuting the real person concerned ?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"No."

Civil Justice

Income from court-fees in the District Courts of Chittoor and North Arcot.

* 337 Q.—Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the court-fees collected in the District Court of North Arcot from the years 1920 to 1930 yearwar ;

(b) the court-fees collected in the District Court of Chittoor from 1910 to 1930 yearwar ; and

(c) the court-fees collected in the District Munsifs' Courts yearwar of Chittoor, Tirupati, Sholinghur, Ranipet, Arni, Madanapalle, Cheyyar and Tiruvannamalai for the years 1910 to 1930 ?

A.—The Government have called for the information.

Inclusion of certain villages in the North Arcot and Chittoor districts within the jurisdiction of the District Munsif, Sholinghur.

* 338 Q.—Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state what is the reason for clubbing together within the jurisdiction of the District Munsif of Sholinghur certain villages in the North Arcot district and certain villages in the Chittoor district ?

A.—The Government have no information. Under section 11 of the Madras Civil Courts Act, 1873, the local jurisdiction of District Munsifs' Courts is fixed and modified by the High Court.

Alterations in the territorial jurisdictions of the District Munsifs of Chittoor, etc.

* 339 Q.—Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state why there have been many alterations in the territorial jurisdictions of the District Munsifs of Chittoor, Tirupati, Sholinghur, Tiruppattur and Ranipet since 1917 ?

A.—The Government have no information. The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 338.

Criminal Justice

Alleged practising of private pleaders at Polur and Tiruvannamalai.

* 340 Q.—Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that uncertificated private pleaders are allowed to practise before the Sub-Magistrates at Polur, Tiruvannamalai and Chengam ;

31st January 1931]

(b) how long they have been practising in these Courts; and

(c) why they have been allowed to do so where there is no dearth of qualified pleaders?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have no information.

(c) The hon. Member's attention is invited to rules 192 and 193 of the Criminal Rules of Practice.

Electricity

Licences for electric supply to Salem, Erode and Coimbatore.

* 341 Q.—Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have any schemes on hand for electrification of Salem, Erode and Coimbatore municipal areas and in what stage each of those schemes now stands;

(b) whether the Government Electrical Inspector prepared a scheme and submitted a report in September 1928 estimating the cost of electrification of Salem and whether the Government approved of the scheme;

(c) whether that scheme has been dropped and whether the Government have resolved upon another scheme of themselves selling to the Salem Municipality a bulk supply of electric energy from a Government transmission line from Mettur and what arrangements the Government have made for the distribution of the supply;

(d) whether the Chairman, Salem Municipal Council, addressed the Government asking for the grant of the distribution licence to the municipality itself;

(e) whether the Government have offered or granted the distribution licence to Messrs. Octavius Steel & Co., Ltd., Calcutta, and whether the licence has been actually issued to that company;

(f) what are the terms or the main terms as to the period of licence, time within which the licensee is to start and complete his initial work, remuneration or payment to the licensee and payment by the municipality;

(g) why the Government preferred the company to the local municipal council;

(h) whether the Erode and Coimbatore Municipal Councils or either of them have asked for the grant of licence to themselves and objected to the licence being granted to Messrs. Octavius Steel & Co., Ltd., Calcutta, or other outsiders; and

(i) whether Government will be pleased to enunciate definitely their policy and programme on the subject?

A.—(a) & (c) Yes. As regards Salem and Erode, the attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 163. The question of a licence for the distribution of power from Pykara Project in Coimbatore towards the end of 1932 is under consideration.

(b) The Electrical Inspector investigated a scheme at the instance of the Municipal Council. The Government received no report on the results of this investigation.

(d) to (h) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 163.